

CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. DEBOW
FREED AND OHIO NORTHERN
UNIVERSITY

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the great work being done at Ohio Northern University by both the staff and students which has recently won the school an outstanding rating as one of the premier institutions in the Midwest. Ohio Northern was ranked fourth in the Midwest by U.S. News & World Report in its ninth annual "America's Best Colleges." This has been the second straight year Ohio Northern has been ranked fourth in the Midwest. The ranking includes 144 similar institutions in 12 States. Institutions are evaluated through various statistical measures with a survey of academic reputation by 2,700 college presidents, deans and admissions directors. Data measure student selectivity, faculty resources, financial resources, retention rate and alumni satisfaction. Ohio Northern continues to have a talented student body, capable faculty, strong academic programs, and high standards. For example, 1 out of 10 ONU students is a high school valedictorian. This year, 262 valedictorians are enrolled at the university. Incredibly, it should not be overlooked that ONU has been operating with a balanced budget for more than 30 consecutive years. For these reasons and numerous others not mentioned, I would like to extend my congratulations and best wishes to this fine institution which really is an asset to the people and State of Ohio.

**THE FOREST BIODIVERSITY AND
CLEARCUTTING PROHIBITION
ACT OF 1995**

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1995

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with my colleague Christopher Shays, I am reintroducing today the Forest Biodiversity and Clearcutting Prohibition Act of 1995.

For years I have sought to protect native forest biodiversity by ending clearcutting and other forms of even-age logging and allowing only selection management of federal lands that are logged. This is the moderate approach toward forest protection. It does not reduce timber production.

This year's legislative agenda, particularly the timber salvage rider, makes this forest management approach all the more appropriate and necessary.

Forests are under assault from expanded salvage logging and the weakening of environmental protections. The Forest Biodiversity Act we are introducing is a moderate reform that allows logging while avoiding the wasteful destruction of forest resources.

Most Americans who are aware of them are appalled by clearcuts. But many of our citizens have the same misconception that I once did—that federally owned forests are protected from such devastation. They don't realize that the U.S. Forest Service and other agencies do

not stand watch to protect our publicly owned forests, but are timber brokers. These agencies arrange for the cutting of timber and its sale—often below the cost to U.S. tax payers and they are using even-age variants of clearcutting—such as seedtree, shelterwood, and heavy salvage—as the predominant logging practices in Federal forests. Most people don't know that these Government agencies then bulldoze and replant, resulting in even-age timber plantations of only one species or two.

If current plans are followed, the remaining diversity in the 60 million acres available for commercial logging on Federal land will be eliminated and each of those acres transformed into timber plantation within the next 15 to 20 years.

The Forest Service and other agencies are using even-age logging in spite of substantial evidence that selection management—cutting individual trees, leaving the canopy and undergrowth relatively undisturbed—is more cost-efficient and has a higher benefit-cost ratio.

Selection logging is more labor intensive, creating more jobs for timber workers, but it avoids the high up-front costs of site preparation and planting. The result is productive logging operation without the elimination of native biodiversity diversity in the forest, without the indiscriminate mowing down of huge stands of trees, leaving only shrubs and bare ground.

The Forest Biodiversity and Clearcutting Prohibition Act would ban clearcutting in its various forms. It would require that Federal land managers maintain the native mixture of tree species, would create a Committee of Scientists to provide independent scientific advice to Federal agencies regarding logging, and would ban logging in roadless areas, in order to save them intact so Congress may decide their permanent status.

My proposal is aimed at protecting the diversity of our nation's forests, and the habitats they provide to wildlife, while demanding sound, proven forest management activities. Mr. SHAYS and I invite every Member to join us in seeking this badly-needed reform.

**REPEALING THE DAVIS-BACON
ACT**

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the time has long since passed for the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act. Yet, this outdated piece of legislation, along with all of its adverse effects, is still a bulwark of the United States labor law. The Davis-Bacon Act should be repealed for several important reasons:

First, it violates Americans' right to contract freely with one another.

Second, it has inequitable effects between people of different races.

Third, it serves no interest other than to protect the wages of white unionized construction labor.

Fourth, it adds over a billion dollars each year directly to Federal Government expenditures.

The Davis-Bacon Act was passed in 1931 amidst a sharp decline in construction activity and falling wages and prices that character-

ized the Great Depression. Its intent was twofold; First, it aimed to halt the decline of wages. Second, Davis-Bacon intended to prevent blacks, migrant workers, and carpet-bagging contractors from competing for contracts that had typically been awarded to local, white unionized labor.

How did the act attempted to achieve these objectives? By requiring that construction workers on federally financed projects be paid the local prevailing wage rate. This prevailing wage, as determined by the Department of Labor is nothing more than the union wage. In other words, this act gives the Secretary of Labor the authority to set the minimum wage for construction workers at a rate greater than that determined by the forces of supply and demand. In effect, this requirement to pay an artificially high wage precludes most minority-owned and nonunionized firms from bidding for government construction contracts since they cannot afford to pay union wages. Consequently, the Davis-Bacon Act serves to protect the jobs and inflated wages of predominantly white unionized labor by insulating them from lower cost competition. It effectively grants the higher cost, unionized contractors their own private monopoly over federally funded construction projects.

But there is another effect that follows directly from the required payment of prevailing wages. Since the Federal Government is prohibited by law from awarding contracts to lower wage, lower cost construction firms, it necessarily spends an excess of what it needs to in order to get the job done. And guess who is paying the difference. In fact, Davis-Bacon adds over a billion dollars each year directly to Federal Government expenditures, not to mention the additional billions added to private expenditures on projects that are partially federally funded. That means you and I are forced to subsidize the multitude of artificially and unnecessarily expensive construction projects because back in 1931, the Government granted a monopoly over the contracts to such projects to a small group of unionized construction workers.

The claim by some of my colleagues and supporters of the act that Davis-Bacon simply recognizes existing wages as determined by the local market, and therefore, adheres to free market principles, indicates a serious misunderstanding of the process through which the free market works. A free market, with competitively determined wages and prices, needs neither government recognition nor enforcement in order to properly function. These are the prices and wages that would exist in the absence of the Department of Labor. The very fact that the Davis-Bacon Act was deemed necessary to require and enforce the payment of prevailing wages indicates that these are not the wages that would prevail in the free market.

If the only group of people whom this legislation benefits is a small number of predominantly white, unionized labor, while imposing significant costs on minority and nonunion construction workers, as well as every taxpayer in the form of increased Federal Government expenditures, then you might ask, how has Davis-Bacon remained the law for 64 years? The act has stubbornly survived precisely because it has a highly unified, powerful constituency. Organized labor groups lobby

through large campaign contributions, persuasion, and the votes of their members to influence labor policy in their favor. On the other hand, opposition to laws like Davis-Bacon is diffused and unorganized, simply because these very real costs, which fall lightly on each American, go largely unnoticed.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, congressional mandates that prohibit arrangements between the buyers and sellers of labor that would otherwise be mutually agreeable directly interferes with freedom of contract. Our Founding Fathers believed that the free marketplace, unobstructed by government intervention, was the best source of progress and prosperity for all people. They believed that the role of government was to protect liberty by acting as an impartial umpire, not to manage outcomes by interfering with every play. The time has come to repeal legislation created for this end. The time is ripe to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.

WORLD POPULATION AWARENESS WEEK

HON. MARTIN T. MEEHAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the theme of World Population Awareness Week, to be held this year from October 22 to 29, is taking the goals worked out in Cairo and putting them into action. His Excellency Governor William F. Weld, of my home State of Massachusetts, has joined State Governors across the country in proclaiming World Population Awareness Week. In honor of this, I would like to request that the following proclamation be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas: World population is currently 5.7 billion and is increasing by 100 million each year, with virtually all growth occurring in the poorest countries and regions where it can least be afforded; and

Whereas: The annual increment to world population is projected to exceed 86 million through the year 2015, with three billion people—the equivalent of the entire world population in 1960—reaching their reproductive years within the next generation; and

Whereas: The environmental and economic impacts of this level of growth may prevent inhabitants of poorer countries from improving their quality of life, and may affect the standard of living in more affluent regions; and

Whereas: The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, Egypt crafted a 20-year Program of Action for achieving a balance between the world's populations, environment, and resources, which was approved by 180 nations, including the United States; and

Whereas: It is appropriate that all Massachusetts citizens recognize the purpose of the Cairo Program of Action;

Now, therefore, I William F. Weld, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim the week of October 22nd through October 28th, 1995, as World Population Awareness Week and urge all the citizens of the Commonwealth to take cognizance of this event and participate fittingly in its observance.

THE C-17 HAS PROVEN THAT IT IS THE BEST

HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 1995

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this November, the U.S. Air Force will reach its final decision on future procurement to fulfill its air transport needs for the next century. I welcome the continued support that most of you have shown for the C-17 in the past. For those who still question, I urge you to look at the C-17 in light of what it has proven.

The C-17 performs 22 missions and is the choice of the Air Force, Army, and Department of Defense while also providing a vital complement to naval transport. The C-17 is performing above and beyond what it was designed to do and has earned the support of these bodies.

How did the C-17 earn this support? By performance. Beginning on July 5, the C-17 engaged in the most extensive evaluation of a major program. In that test, it laid to rest the arguments of critics who had questioned its ability to perform. In 4 weeks of testing, the C-17 proved, in the words of Gen. Robert Rutherford, Commander of the Air Mobility Command, that it "truly is the most reliable, most maintainable and most versatile airlifter in the world today." I enclose additional information for the RECORD that discusses the outstanding achievement of the C-17. This plane has evolved to be the performer it is today, and will continue to meet the many needs of our country well into the next century. Whether it be rapid response to aggression around the world, meeting immediate tactical needs of our forces in the field, or providing transport for humanitarian assistance, the C-17 is the only choice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the U.S. Air Force press release of August 5, 1995, be included at the end of my remarks.

C-17'S EXCEED GOALS DURING INTENSIVE EVALUATION

CHARLESTON AFB, SC.—Twelve C-17 Globemaster III's logged more than 2,250 hours and transported 11 million lbs. of cargo, personnel, and equipment during an important 30-day evaluation ending today.

The Reliability, Maintainability, and Availability Evaluation, or RM&AE, began July 7. Aircrews and support personnel from Charleston AFB, S.C. flew and maintained the high-technology airlifters for nine days of up-tempo, peacetime operations, followed by a seven-day simulated multi-regional conflict airlift scenario, then 14 days of return to peacetime.

During the RM&AE, Air Force personnel exercised the C-17's full spectrum of capabilities. The planes were used to transport personnel, equipment and palletized cargo to and from seven sites, six in the U.S. and one overseas. In addition to "air land" missions (those transferring loads at other airfields), the Globemaster III's performed formation personnel airdrops, container delivery system airdrops, sequential heavy equipment airdrops, small austere airfield operations, short field landings, air refuelings, combat offloads, semi-prepared dirt surface landings, and training proficiency sorties.

The intensive evaluation, designated to compare actual aircraft performances with

design requirements and goals, put the aircraft through its paces in operationally realistic scenarios. Launch reliability, the C-17's "on time departure" rate for the entire 30 days, exceeded 99 percent, with requirements for necessary maintenance falling well below the maximum rate permitted by contract. Utilization rates or Ute rates, one of the more critical performance areas, easily exceeded required target rates in all areas: the peacetime ute rate was 4.75 with a target rate of 3.2; wartime sustained ute rate was 12.7 with a target of 10; wartime surge ute rate for the first 24-hour period was 16.6 with a target of 15.2, the rate for the second 24-hour period totalled 17.1 with a 15.2 target.

During the month-long operation, C-17s transported 5,500 tons of Air Force and Army equipment and airdropped nearly 700,000 lbs, including two Sheridan tanks, and more than 3,000 paratroopers of the Army's 82nd Airborne Division. More than 6 million lbs of fuel was offloaded to C-17s during 162 air refueling tanker sorties.

In addition to verifying contract compliance, RM&AE results also provided additional data to support initial operational testing and an accurate forecast of how the C-17 fleet will perform in future real-world operations.

The Globemaster III, capable of carrying 169,000-lb loads into airstrips as short as 3,000 feet long, demonstrated its availability and ease of "throughput" during RM&AE. (Throughput is the rate at which cargo and personnel can be processed through an airfield in a given period). During the week of wartime activities, C-17s transported six of the Army's M1A1 Abrams main battle tanks. These enormous armored vehicles, each weighing more than 125,000 lbs, were carried aboard C-17s to a forward operating base in the Mojave Desert of Southern California, stopping in less than 2,800 feet. During the 30-day evaluation, the C-17s airlifted a total of 12 M1A1 Abrams tanks, 12 Bradley fighting vehicles, and 14 Sheridan tanks.

The wartime phase was designed to simulate a multi-regional conflict scenario, with aircraft transporting personnel and equipment great distances (both eastbound and westbound) allowing the C-17 to demonstrate its important strategic and tactical capabilities. Nearly half of the 2,250 hours were flown during this intensive seven-day wartime phase. Aircrews flew nearly 17 hours per aircraft per day during a 48-hour period, demonstrating the delivery capability the planes may be called upon to perform during an initial deployment period.

During an actual contingency operation, Air Mobility Command's new airlifter could change the way the Air Force delivers equipment. In the past, equipment was flown by strategic airlifter to a main operating base with a large runway and a solid support structure. There the cargo was transferred to smaller aircraft, usually C-130s, or taken over land to its final destination.

The C-17 eliminates these intermediate steps, saving man-hours and conserving support equipment, while offering the Air Force an important new capability: direct delivery from home base in the U.S. to remote, short field locations worldwide.

Through both peacetime operations and the week of wartime deployment, the C-17 has proven it's more than capable of doing the job for which it was designed. The RM&AE gave the aircraft and the personnel who fly them and maintain them, an opportunity to demonstrate these capabilities in an operationally realistic environment.